[3rd September 1928

Instructions to Revenue officers regarding kudimaramat.

*9 *Q.*—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the "more specific instructions to Revenue Officers" regarding kudimaramat referred to in paragraph 2 of G.O. Mis. No. 2463, Revenue, dated 30th November 1927, have been issued; and

(*b*) if so, what they are?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) A copy of the instructions issued is placed on the table of the House.[a]

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—"May I know from the hon. the Revenue Member whether, in issuing the instructions that they have done, they have considered the claims of the ryots under the word 'customary,' and whether they intend issuing any further instructions to define exactly what the word 'customary' should mean in the eye of the revenue officials?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"The instructions can only apply to customary works, Sir, because, if the work is not customary, it does not fall on the ryot to do it. But the Government do not propose to issue any definition of the word 'customary'."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—"May I know if the hon. the Revenue Member is aware that under the word 'customary' all sorts of things are brought in, and the revenue officials do require some guidance so as to decide which is customary and which is not customary and as to the kind of thing which should be considered customary?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"I would suggest, Sir, that whether a work is customary or not does not depend on the nature of any particular work, but on whether it has been the custom for that particular work to be done by the ryot."

Plans and estimates for the Thokapalli project.

*10 *Q.*—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the plans and estimates regarding the Thokapalli project in the Kurnool district said to have been under revision in the Superintending Engineer's Office (vide page 334, Madras Legislative Council Proceedings, Volume XXXVIII) have been received and considered;

(*b*) whether the Government have passed orders; and

(*c*) if so, what the orders are?

A.—In January last, on the application of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, the Government sanctioned the employment for a period of six months of a draughtsman to scrutinize the plans and estimates made in 1922 and bring them up to date. The revised plans and estimates have not yet been received.

---

a Printed as Appendix I on pages 105–106 infra.

3rd September 1928]

Subsequently a report was received from the Board of Revenue suggesting that the work, if carried out according to the plans prepared in 1922, would submerge an area of valuable wet land. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation was requested to examine this point when scrutinizing the estimates. His report on it has also not yet been received.

Action taken on the Chief Engineer's Report on the Pullampet project.

* 11 Q.—Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the report of the Chief Engineer on the Pullampet project (vide page 334, Volume XXXVIII, Madras Legislative Council Proceedings) has been received and considered; and

(b) what action the Government propose to take thereon?

A.—(a) & (b) The Chief Engineer for Irrigation has not yet submitted his report on the project. On an application from him the Government have recently sanctioned the employment for a period of six months, of an establishment for the examination of the gauging results connected with the project.

Legislation regarding kudimaramat.

* 12 Q.—Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the consideration of the law relating to kudimaramat has been completed;

(b) whether the Government have come to any conclusions in the matter; and

(c) if the answers to (a) and (b) are in the positive, when they propose to allow my Bill to be introduced?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) It does not lie with the Government but with His Excellency the Governor to grant or refuse sanction to the introduction of the Bill referred to.

Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao:—"May I know what advice the Government have given to His Excellency the Governor in the matter of my Bill?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks:—"I must ask for notice of that question. I am not sure that it is a question that can be answered at all."

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar:—"May I know whether, in answer to clauses (a) and (b) of the question, the Government have to say anything so far as the kudimaramat is concerned, apart from the Bill of the hon. Member (Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao)?"

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks:—"Perhaps there may be a great deal to say on it when the occasion comes."

Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar:—"I thought, Sir, that clauses (a) and (b) clearly gave a wide scope for the hon. Member to say all that he could say. Clause (c) only refers to the Bill. Clauses (a) and (b) are general questions relating to kudimaramat. I do not understand why the hon. the